arXiv:math/0206227v1 [math.PR] 21 Jun 2002

Convergence of the Poincaré constant

Oliver Johnson

February 1, 2008

Abstract

The Poincaré constant R_Y of a random variable Y relates the $L^2(Y)$-norm of a function g and its derivative g'. Since $R_Y - \mathrm{Var}\,(Y)$ is positive, with equality if and only if Y is normal, it can be seen as a distance from the normal distribution. In this paper we establish the best possible rate of convergence of this distance in the Central Limit Theorem. Furthermore, we show that R_Y is finite for discrete mixtures of normals, allowing us to add rates to the proof of the Central Limit Theorem in the sense of relative entropy.

1 Introduction and results

Poincaré (or spectral gap) inequalities provide a relationship between L^2 norms on functions and their derivatives.

Definition 1.1 (Borovkov and Utev) *Given a random variable Y, define the Poincaré constant R_Y:*

$$R_Y = \sup_{g \in H_1(Y)} \frac{\mathrm{Var}\; g(Y)}{\mathbb{E}g'(Y)^2},$$

where $H_1(Y)$ is the space of absolutely continuous functions on the real line such that $\mathrm{Var}\; g(Y) > 0$ *and* $\mathbb{E}g'(Y)^2 < \infty$.

Key words: Poincaré constant, spectral gap, Central Limit Theorem, Fisher Information

AMS 2000 subject classification: 60E15, 60F99

Address: Statistical Laboratory, Centre for Mathematical Sciences, Wilberforce Road, Cambridge, CB3 0WB, United Kingdom. Email: otj1000@cam.ac.uk.

R_Y will not in general be finite, however it will be finite for the normal and other strongly unimodal distributions (see for example Klaasen (1985), Chernoff (1981), Chen (1982), Cacoullos (1982), Nash (1958), Borovkov and Utev (1984)).

We will exploit various relationships between the Poincaré constant and Fisher information:

Definition 1.2 *For a random variable Y with smooth density p, define the score function $\rho_Y(y) = p'(y)/p(y)$, and Fisher information $I(Y) = \mathbb{E}\rho(Y)^2$.*

Notice that for a given Y, if g is a local maximum of Var $g(Y)/(\mathbb{E}g'(Y)^2)$ then for all functions h and small t:

$$\frac{\text{Var }(g+th)}{\mathbb{E}(g'+th')^2} \leq \frac{\text{Var }(g)}{\mathbb{E}g'^2} = R_g,$$

so multiplying out, $0 \leq t^2(R_g\mathbb{E}h'^2 - \mathbb{E}h^2) + 2t(R_g\mathbb{E}g'h' - \mathbb{E}gh)$, which can only hold in an interval around zero if:

$$R_g\mathbb{E}g'h' = \mathbb{E}gh. \tag{1}$$

Integration by parts implies therefore that $g = -R_g(\rho_Y g' + g'')$, so local maxima correspond to eigenfunctions of the Laplacian $D_Y g = (\rho_Y g' + g'')$, and the global maximum to the least strictly negative eigenvalue (hence the alternative name of spectral gap inequality).

Example 1.3 *The Poincaré constant can be infinite. For example, consider the discrete random variable, where $\mathbb{P}(X = 1) = \mathbb{P}(X = -1) = 1/2$. Then, we can choose g such that $g'(-1) = g'(1) = \epsilon$, but $g(-1) = -1$, $g(1) = 1$, so that* Var $g(X) = 1$, *but $\mathbb{E}g'(X)^2 = \epsilon^2$. This argument will work for any discrete random variable, indeed any random variable whose support is not an interval.*

However, our first main result shows that discrete random variables perturbed by small normals have a finite Poincaré constant:

Theorem 1.4 *Consider X, a random variable with variance σ^2 taking a finite number of values with probabilities $p_1, p_2, \ldots p_n$ respectively, and Z_τ an*

indepedent normal with mean zero variance τ. Then $Y_\tau = X + Z_\tau$ satisfies a Poincaré inequality with constant

$$R_{Y_\tau} = \tau \left(1 + \left(\frac{\sigma^2}{\tau \min_s p_s} \right) \exp \left(\frac{\sigma^2}{\tau \min_s p_s} \right) \right).$$

Proof See Section 2. □

Note that part 8 of Theorem 1.1 of Utev (1992) also shows that R_{Y_τ} is finite. However, our bound has an explicit dependence on σ^2, and so has independent interest.

In a paper by Johnson and Barron (2002), we show that finiteness of the Poincaré constant gives an explicit rate of convergence of relative entropy distance in the Central Limit Theorem. This is a strong result, and implies convergence in L^1.

Theorems 2, 3 and 4 of Borovkov and Utev provide the following results:

Lemma 1.5 *For the constant R_X defined above:*

1. $R_{aX+b} = a^2 R_X$
2. *If X, Y are independent, then $R_{X+Y} \leq R_X + R_Y$*
3. $R_X \geq \mathrm{Var}\,(X)$*, with equality if and only if X is normal*
4. *If R_X is finite then $\mathbb{E} \exp(|X - \mathbb{E}X|/12\sqrt{R_X}) \leq 2$, so X has moments of all orders.*
5. *If $R_{X_n}/\mathrm{Var}\,(X_n) \to 1$, then $\mathbb{E}w(X_n) \to \mathbb{E}w(Z)$,where Z is normal, for any continuous w with $|w(t)| < \exp(c|t|)$, for sufficiently small c.*

The first three properties are reminiscent of those of Fisher Information – a subadditive relation holds and the minimising case characterises the normal distribution. In analogy with the approach to the Central Limit Theorem developed by Brown (1982) and Barron (1986), we add an extra term into the subadditive relation $R_{X+Y} \leq R_X + R_Y$, which is sandwiched as convergence occurs. This gives us an answer to the question posed by Chen and Lou (1990), of identifying the limit of the Poincaré constant in the Central Limit Theorem. This was also answered by Utev (1992), though without the explicit rate of convergence that we provide.

Theorem 1.6 *Consider $X_1, X_2, \ldots$ IID, with $R = R_{X_i}$ and $I = I(X)$ finite. Defining $U_n = (X_1 + \ldots X_n)/\sqrt{n\sigma^2}$, then there exists a constant C, depending only on I and R, such that $R_{U_n} - 1 \leq C/n$.*

Proof See Section 3. □

We can argue that this is the best possible rate, up to the choice of the constant. Considering $g(x) = x^2 - 1$, we know that $R_X \geq (\mathbb{E}X^4 - 1)/4$. Since $\mathbb{E}U_{2n}^4 - 1 = (\mathbb{E}U_n^4 - 1)/2 > 0$, if $R_{U_n} - 1 = f(n)/n$ then $f(2^k)/2^k = R_{U_{2^k}} - 1 \geq (\mathbb{E}X^4 - 1)/2^k$, so $f(2^k) \geq \mathbb{E}X^4 - 1$ and hence does not tend to zero.

Since we can perturb random variables by adding small normals to ensure that the Fisher information is finite, we use this to prove a strong form of the Central Limit Theorem.

Theorem 1.7 *If $X_1, X_2, \ldots$ are IID random variables with mean 0, variance σ^2 and finite $R_X = R$, then $U_n = (X_1 + \ldots X_n)/\sqrt{n\sigma^2}$ has the property that:*

$$\mathbb{E}w(U_n) \to \mathbb{E}w(Z),$$

where Z is standard normal, for any continuous w such that $w(t) \leq \exp c|t|$, where $c < c_0 = 1/(12\sqrt{R})$.

Proof Given a random variable U, define $U^\tau \sim U + Z_\tau$. Now, since $R_{U_n^\tau} \leq R_{U_n} + \tau \leq R + \tau$, by Lemma 1.5.4, taking τ_0 such that $c = 1/(12\sqrt{R + \tau_0})$:

$$\mathbb{E}\exp(c|U_n^\tau|) \leq 2,$$

for all n, if $\tau \leq \tau_0, c < c_0$.

Now, since U_n^τ have uniformly bounded Fisher information $I(U_n^\tau) \leq I(Z_\tau) = 1/\tau$, and $R_{U_n^\tau} \leq R + \tau$, Theorem 1.6 implies that $\mathbb{E}w(U_n^\tau) \to \mathbb{E}w(Z^\tau)$.

Hence, since:

$$\begin{aligned} &|\mathbb{E}w(U_n) - \mathbb{E}w(Z)| \\ &\quad \leq \quad |\mathbb{E}w(U_n^\tau) - \mathbb{E}w(U_n)| + |\mathbb{E}w(U_n^\tau) - \mathbb{E}w(Z^\tau)| + |\mathbb{E}w(Z) - \mathbb{E}w(Z^\tau)|, \end{aligned}$$

we need only show that given ϵ, $|\mathbb{E}w(U^\tau) - \mathbb{E}w(U)| \leq \epsilon$ for τ small enough. This follows by uniform integrability arguments (see Theorem 25.12 of Billingsley), since $\mathbb{E}|w(U^\tau)|^p \leq \mathbb{E}\exp cp|U_\tau| \leq 2$, for some small p, and since $w(U^\tau)$ converges weakly to $w(U)$. □

2 Finiteness of R for mixtures of normals

Proof of Theorem 1.4 Without loss of generality, consider X taking a finite number of values $a_1 > a_2 > \ldots > a_n$ with probabilities $p_1, p_2, \ldots p_n$ respectively, where $\mathbb{E}X = \sum_i p_i a_i = 0$.

We introduce the 'squared span' $M = \max(|a_1^2 - a_2^2|, |a_2^2 - a_3^2|, \ldots |a_{n-1}^2 - a_n^2|, (a_1 - a_2)^2, (a_2 - a_3)^2, \ldots (a_{n-1} - a_n)^2)$, and write p for $\min_s p_s$.

By Theorem 1 of Borovkov and Utev, we need to check that for some R and all x, the density f_τ of Y satisfies:

$$\int_x^\infty y f_\tau(y) dy \leq R f_\tau(x). \tag{2}$$

Since $f_\tau(y) = \sum_i p_i \phi_\tau(y - a_i)$, the LHS of Equation (2) becomes (defining $u_j = \sum_{i=1}^j p_i a_i$ and $a_{n+1} = -\infty$):

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_x^\infty y f_\tau(y) dy &= \sum_{i=1}^n p_i \int_x^\infty (y - a_i)\phi_\tau(y - a_i) dy + \sum_{i=1}^n p_i a_i \int_x^\infty \phi_\tau(y - a_i) dy \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^n p_i \tau \phi_\tau(x - a_i) dy + \sum_{i=1}^n p_i a_i \int_{x-a_i}^\infty \phi_\tau(y) dy \\
&= \tau f_\tau(x) + \sum_{i=1}^n p_i a_i \sum_{j=i}^n \int_{x-a_j}^{x-a_{j+1}} \phi_\tau(y) dy \\
&= \tau f_\tau(x) + \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} u_j \left(\int_{x-a_j}^{x-a_{j+1}} \phi_\tau(y) dy \right),
\end{aligned}$$

since $u_n = 0$, so for each interval $I_j = (x - a_j, x - a_{j+1})$ we need to consider bounds on $\min_{y \in I_j} y^2$.

We write r for the index such that $a_r \leq x < a_{r-1}$.

First, we consider $x \geq 0$, where we can distinguish 3 cases: for $j < r$; $x - a_{j+1} < 0$, so for $y \in I_j$:

$$y^2 \geq (x - a_{j+1})^2 = (x - a_j)^2 + 2(a_j - a_{j+1})x + (a_{j+1}^2 - a_j^2) = (x - a_j)^2 - M.$$

For $j = r$; $y \in I_j$ means that: $y^2 \geq 0 \geq (x - a_j)^2 - (a_{j-1} - a_j)^2 \geq (x - a_j)^2 - M$.

For $j > r$; $x - a_j > 0$, so for $y \in I_j$: $y^2 \geq (x - a_j)^2$.

Hence for all j, $\min_{y\in I_j} y^2 \geq (x-a_j)^2 - M$, so:

$$\int_{x-a_j}^{x-a_{j+1}} \phi_\tau(y)dy \leq (a_j - a_{j+1}) \max_{y\in I_j} \phi_\tau(y) \leq (a_j - a_{j+1})\phi_\tau(x-a_j)\exp(M/2\tau).$$

In Lemma 2.1, we prove two technical results, that $u_j(a_j - a_{j+1}) \leq \sigma^2$, and that $Mp \leq 2\sigma^2$. This allows us to deduce that for $x \geq 0$:

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{j=1}^{n-1} u_j \left(\int_{x-a_j}^{x-a_{j+1}} \phi_\tau(y)dy \right) &\leq \exp(M/2\tau) \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} u_j(a_j - a_{j+1})\phi_\tau(x-a_j) \\
&\leq \exp(M/2\tau) \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \sigma^2 \phi_\tau(x-a_j) \\
&\leq \exp(\sigma^2/\tau p) \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \sigma^2 (p_j/p)\phi_\tau(x-a_j),
\end{aligned}$$

as required.

Similarly, for $x \leq 0$, we deduce that for $y \in I_j$, $\min_{y\in I_j} y^2 \geq (x-a_{j+1})^2 - M$, and thus:

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{j=1}^{n-1} u_j \left(\int_{x-a_j}^{x-a_{j+1}} \phi_\tau(y)dy \right) &\leq \exp(M/2\tau) \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} u_j(a_j - a_{j+1})\phi_\tau(x-a_{j+1}) \\
&\leq \exp(\sigma^2/\tau p) \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \sigma^2 (p_{j+1}/p)\phi_\tau(x-a_{j+1}).
\end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 2.1 *Using the notation above:* $u_j(a_j - a_{j+1}) \leq \sigma^2$, *and* $Mp \leq 2\sigma^2$.

Proof Note that $u_j = \sum_{i=1}^{j} p_i a_i = -\sum_{i=j+1}^{n} p_i a_i$.

For $a_{j+1} \geq 0$: $u_j(a_j - a_{j+1}) \leq u_j a_j \leq \sum_{i=1}^{j} p_i a_i a_j \leq \sum_{i=1}^{j} p_i a_i^2$.

For $a_j \leq 0$: $u_j(a_j - a_{j+1}) \leq -u_j a_{j+1} \leq \sum_{i=j+1}^{n} p_i a_i a_{j+1} \leq \sum_{i=j+1}^{n} p_i a_i^2$.

For $a_{j+1} \leq 0 \leq a_j$: $u_j(a_j - a_{j+1}) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{j} p_i a_i a_j u_j + \sum_{i=j+1}^{n} p_i a_i a_{j+1} \leq \sum_{i=1}^{n} p_i a_i^2$.

For the second part, we consider two cases, firstly where $M = a_s^2 - a_{s\pm1}^2$. In this case:

$$\sigma^2 = \sum_t p_t a_t^2 \geq p_s a_s^2 = p_s(a_s^2 - a_{s\pm1}^2) + p_s a_{s\pm1}^2 \geq pM.$$

Alternatively, if $M = (a_s - a_{s+1})^2$ then:

$$\sigma^2 = \sum_t p_t a_t^2 \geq p(a_s^2 + a_{s+1}^2) \geq (p/2)(a_s - a_{s+1})^2 \geq pM/2.$$

□

3 Convergence of the Poincaré constant

We establish an explicit rate of convergence of the Poincaré constant, using projection inequalities similar to those in Johnson and Barron (2002)

Lemma 3.1 *Given independent random variables X, Y with Poincaré constants R_X, R_Y, for any function g:*

$$\text{Var } g(X+Y) \leq (R_X + R_Y)\mathbb{E}g'(X+Y)^2 - \frac{R_X}{R_X I(Y) + 1}\text{Var } g'(X+Y),$$

and hence $R_{X+Y} \leq R_X + R_Y$.

Proof Without loss of generality, we can consider g such that $\mathbb{E}g(X+Y) = 0$, and define $h(u) = \mathbb{E}_Y g(u+Y)$, which thus also has mean zero. Now:

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{Var } g(X+Y) &= \mathbb{E}g^2(X+Y) \\
&= \mathbb{E}_X\left(\mathbb{E}g^2(X+Y)|X\right) \\
&= \mathbb{E}_X\text{Var }(g(X+Y)|X) + \mathbb{E}_X\left(\mathbb{E}g(X+Y)|X\right)^2 \\
&\leq R_Y\mathbb{E}_X(\mathbb{E}_Y g'(X+Y)^2|X) + \mathbb{E}h(X)^2 \\
&\leq R_Y\mathbb{E}g'^2(X+Y) + R_X\mathbb{E}h'(X)^2.
\end{aligned}$$

To consider the second term, we use the score function ρ_Y and define:

$$f(x) = \mathbb{E}_Y\left[(g'(x+Y) - h'(x))\rho_Y(Y)\right],$$

where by the Stein equation, $f(x) = -\mathbb{E}_Y g''(x+Y) = -h''(x)$. Further, by Cauchy-Schwarz:

$$\mathbb{E}h''(X)^2 = \mathbb{E}f(X)^2 \leq I(Y)\mathbb{E}(g'(X+Y) - h'(X))^2,$$

so that:

$$\text{Var } h'(X) \leq R_X \mathbb{E}h''(X)^2 \leq R_X I(Y) \left(\mathbb{E}g'(X+Y)^2 - \mathbb{E}h'(X)^2\right),$$

and writing $\mu = \mathbb{E}h'(X) = \mathbb{E}g'(X+Y)$, we obtain:

$$\mathbb{E}h'(X)^2(1 + R_X I(Y)) \leq R_X I(Y)\mathbb{E}g'(X+Y)^2 + \mu^2,$$

which, rearranging, leads to:

$$\mathbb{E}h'(X)^2 \leq \mathbb{E}g'(X+Y)^2 - \frac{\text{Var } g'(X+Y)}{R_X I(Y) + 1}.$$

□

Next we need a Lemma which again uses the idea that if g' is nearly constant, then g is close to linear. We'd like to apply it to the optimal g, which achieves the maximum in Definition 1.1. However, rather than use compactness arguments to show such a function exists, we can instead use a 'good' g instead.

Lemma 3.2 *For any random variable W with mean zero, and any function g such that $R(t) = \text{Var } (g(W) + tW)/\mathbb{E}(g'(W) + t)^2$ has a local maximum at $t = 0$:*

$$\left(\frac{\text{Var } g(W)}{\mathbb{E}g'(W)^2} - \text{Var } (W)\right) \leq 3R_W \sqrt{\frac{\text{Var } g'(W)}{\mathbb{E}g'(W)^2}}.$$

Proof Without loss assume that $\mathbb{E}g(W) = 0$, and write $\mu = \mathbb{E}g'(W)$ and $\delta_g = \text{Var } g'(W)/\mathbb{E}g'(W)^2 = 1 - \mu^2/\mathbb{E}g'(W)^2$ implies:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}g^2(W) \\
&= \mathbb{E}(g(W) - \mu W)^2 + 2\mu\mathbb{E}W(g(W) - \mu W) + \mu^2\mathbb{E}W^2 \\
&\leq \mathbb{E}(g(W) - \mu W)^2 + 2|\mu|\sqrt{\text{Var } (W)}\sqrt{\mathbb{E}(g(W) - \mu W)^2} + \mu^2 \text{Var } (W) \\
&\leq (\mathbb{E}g'(W)^2)\left(R_W\left(\delta_g + 2\sqrt{\delta_g(1-\delta_g)}\right) + (1-\delta_g)\text{Var } (W)\right) \\
&\leq (\mathbb{E}g'(W)^2)\left(3R_W\sqrt{\delta_g} + \text{Var } (W)\right)
\end{aligned}$$

since $\mathbb{E}(g(W)-\mu W)^2 \leq R_W \mathbb{E}(g'(W)-\mu)^2 = R_W \text{Var}\,(g'(W)) \leq R_W \delta_g \mathbb{E}g'(W)^2$, and since by Lemma 1.5.3, Var $(W) \leq R_W$. □

Note, we can come up with tighter bounds: for example taking $h(W) = W$ in Equation (1), $\mathbb{E}Wg(W) = R(0)\mu$. Hence $\mu(R(0) - \text{Var}\,(W)) = \mathbb{E}(g(W) - \mu W)W \leq \sqrt{\text{Var}\,(W)}\sqrt{\mathbb{E}(g(W)-\mu W)^2} \leq \sqrt{R_W \text{Var}\,(W) \text{Var}\, g'(W)}$. This implies that:

$$R(0) - \text{Var}\,(W) \leq R_W \sqrt{\frac{\delta_g}{1-\delta_g}}.$$

However, Lemma 3.2 is sufficient for our purposes.

Proof of Theorem 1.6 We consider convergence along the 'powers of 2' subsequence $S_k = U_{2^k}$, which implies convergence for the whole sequence by subadditivity.

For all k, $1 \leq R_{S_k} \leq R$, and $I_{S_k} \leq I$. Taking $X = S_k/\sqrt{2}$ and $Y = S_k'/\sqrt{2}$ (an identical copy) in Lemma 3.1 implies (since $R_{S_k/\sqrt{2}} = R_{S_k}/2$ and $I(S_k/\sqrt{2}) = 2I(S_k)$) that for any g:

$$\delta_g = \frac{\text{Var}\, g'(S_{k+1})}{\mathbb{E}g'(S_{k+1})^2} \leq 2(1/R_{S_k} + I(S_k)) \left(R_{S_k} - \frac{\text{Var}\, g(S_{k+1})}{\mathbb{E}g'(S_{k+1})^2} \right).$$

Now, given $W = S_{k+1}$, we can find h such that Var $h/\mathbb{E}h'^2 \geq \max(R - \epsilon, \text{Var}\,(W))$. Since Var $(h(W) + tW)/\mathbb{E}(h' + t)^2$ tends to Var (W) at $\pm\infty$, and has one maximum t_0 and one minimum, we can find $g(W) = h(W) + t_0 W$, which satisfies the conditions of Lemma 3.2:

$$\left((R_{S_{k+1}} - \epsilon - 1)_+\right)^2 \leq \left(\frac{\text{Var}\, g(S_{k+1})}{\mathbb{E}g'(S_{k+1})^2} - 1 \right)^2 \leq 9R_{S_{k+1}}^2 \delta_g \leq C(R_{S_k} - R_{S_{k+1}} + \epsilon),$$

where $x_+ = \max(x, 0)$ and $C = 18R_{S_{k+1}}^2(1/R_{S_k} + I(S_k)) \leq 18R(IR + 1)$. That is, since ϵ is arbitrary,

$$(R_{S_{k+1}} - 1)^2 \leq C(R_{S_{k+1}} - R_{S_k}). \tag{3}$$

Note that since R_{S_k} is decreasing and bounded below, successive differences tend to zero, and thus $R_{S_k} \to 1$.

To obtain a rate, write $u_k = (R_{S_k} - 1)/C$, Equation (3) gives $u_k(1 + u_k) \leq u_{k-1}$. Since u_k are decreasing: $\ldots u_{n+2}^2 \leq u_{n+1}^2 \leq u_n^2 \leq u_{n-1} - u_n$, and hence:

$u_n^2 \leq u_{n-1} - u_n$, $u_n^2 \leq u_{n-2} - u_{n-1}$, $u_n^2 \leq u_{n-3} - u_{n-2}$ and so on. Summing, we obtain that for $m \leq n$: $(n-m)u_n^2 \leq u_m - u_n \leq u_m$. Taking $n = 2^r$, $m = 2^{r-1}$ implies that:

$$u_{2^r} \leq \sqrt{\frac{u_{2^{r-1}}}{2^{r-1}}}.$$

Repeating this N times, we deduce that (since $u_k \leq u_1 \leq 1$):

$$u_{2^r} \leq 2^{-\sum_{j=1}^{N}(r-j)/2^j} = 2^{-r+2}2^{(r-2-N)/2^N},$$

so if $N = r-2$, then $u_{2^r} \leq 4/2^r$, and we can 'fill in the gaps' by subadditivity, to show that $u_k \leq 16/k$ for all k. □

Acknowledgements

The author is a Fellow of Christ's College, Cambridge, who helped support a trip to Yale University during which many useful discussions with Andrew Barron took place. Yurii Suhov of Cambridge University and Alexander Holroyd of UCLA provided useful advice, and the anonymous referee provided several extremely useful improvements to the proofs.

References

[1] A.R. Barron. Entropy and the Central Limit Theorem. *Annals of Probability*, 14:336–342, 1986.

[2] P. Billingsley. *Convergence of Probability Measures*. John Wiley, New York, 1968.

[3] A.A. Borovkov and S.A. Utev. On an inequality and a related characterisation of the normal distribution. *Theory of Probability and Its Applications*, 28:219–228, 1984.

[4] L.D. Brown. A proof of the Central Limit Theorem motivated by the Cramér-Rao inequality. In G. Kallianpur, P.R. Krishnaiah, and J.K. Ghosh, editors, *Statistics and Probability: Essays in Honour of C.R. Rao*, pages 141–148. North-Holland, New York, 1982.

[5] Th. Cacoullos. On upper and lower bounds for the variance of a function of a random variable. *Annals of Probability*, 10:799–809, 1982.

[6] L.H.Y. Chen. An inequality for the normal distribution. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, 12:306–315, 1982.

[7] L.H.Y. Chen and J.H. Lou. Asymptotic normality and convergence of eigenvalues. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, 34:197, 1993.

[8] H. Chernoff. A note on an inequality involving the normal distribution. *Annals of Probability*, 9:533–535, 1981.

[9] O.T. Johnson and A.R. Barron. Fisher Information Inequalities and the Central Limit Theorem. *In submission*, 2002.

[10] C.A.J. Klaasen. On an inequality of Chernoff. *Annals of Probability*, 13:966–974, 1985.

[11] J. Nash. Continuity of solutions of parabolic and elliptic equations. *American Journal of Mathematics*, 80:931–954, 1958.

[12] S.A. Utev. An application of integrodifferential inequalities in probability theory. *Siberian Advances in Mathematics*, 2:164–199, 1992.